

A PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR TACTICAL ADVERTISING

1005042845

September, 1977

INTRODUCTION

As a companion to the long term program of strategic advertising, the Communications Committee recommends the adoption of a program of tactical advertising.

The long term program recommended has, for its initial audience, "the tobacco family" -- from which it is hoped that it will be extended to the country generally and serve as a base of support for all other communications from the industry.

Even prior to that extension, however, there is an immediate need for a capability to respond tactically to specific issues on a national, regional or community basis.

The following program provides that capability.

1005047846

OBJECTIVES

1. To foster the full, free and informed public discussion needed for a balanced view of issues affecting the industry;
2. To provide specific factual response to misstatements of fact or distortions;
3. To provide for adequate dissemination of the rarely-heard "other side" of issues affecting the industry;
4. To provide a recognizable and flexible format for this varied information on a national, regional or community basis.

1005047847

STRATEGY

1. Strong graphic look. The materials contemplated for use will be of widely different kinds, for use in different publications with no foreseeable frequency. A strong graphic look is required to unify them so they may build over time a recognizable presence as a campaign based on factual materials, and for The Tobacco Institute as a trustworthy source of these materials.
2. "The Other Side." This is the title chosen for the materials. For two reasons. One, it is honest. Whatever may be the specific character of the particular ad, it is certain to be the rarely heard, or "other side," of the issue being discussed since this is the primary objective of the campaign. Two, any long-continued presentation of a single side, such as has been the case in all the areas of interest to the industry, builds its own potential audience for "the other side." People recognize that for any issue there is at least one other side, and want to hear it.

1005047848

3. Size. All sizes recommended are less than full page size -- which it is thought would be required only in exceptional circumstances. The governing factors are: (1) "response" ads should be moderate and restrained, their size proportional to the article responded to and the importance of the subject, and (2) reprinted articles should be of the size of the original except where larger type is needed for readability.
4. Frequency. Frequency is wholly unpredictable except that some attempt should be made at a continuing program. A special format -- the two-column one -- has been devised to aid in this. It is essentially for those shorter items, too small for response in the regular sizes, which are capable of quick, factual correction, and those occasional brief insightful remarks of those who see "the other side" but which are not widely disseminated. It is hoped that enough of these can be collected to provide some regularity in the appearance of "The Other Side" in selected Sunday papers.

1005047849

THE FORMATS

1. Typeset example of proposed first ad.
2. Mock-up of page to show relative size.
3. Other format sizes, including two-column one recommended for "short takes" with some regularity in Sunday papers.

Copy has been kept to the bare minimum required for identification and explanation. The items should speak for themselves. Final copy has not yet been legally approved.

1005042850

The Other Side.

Antismoking groups frequently claim that smoking should be repressed because smoking can "harm" the nonsmoker. The other side of this issue is rarely heard. The following article appeared in the San Francisco Examiner of Aug. 11, 1977.

Second-hand smoke—is it harmful?

By Charles H. Hine, M.D.

AS A MEDICAL SCIENTIST involved in research, I have been asked more and more often of late to comment on legislation now pending in the California Legislature to prohibit or restrict smoking in all places of employment and most places to which the public has access.

Rather than enter the political arena, I confine my remarks to facts established by competent research and in which qualified medical experts—including those who often represent anti-smoking organizations—concur.

Senate Bill 500, now under consideration by our Legislature, begins with these words: "The Legislature finds and declares that tobacco smoke and smoke from other plants is harmful to the health, comfort and environment of non-smokers..."

The Legislature cannot doubt that tobacco smoke is disturbing to the comfort and desired environment of non-smokers, but to declare it harmful to the health of non-smokers contradicts medical facts.

A non-smoker cannot contract cancer or other diseases from second-hand smoke.

Before further addressing the question of disease, it is necessary to dispel several misconceptions about sidestream tobacco smoke.

Firstly, because it is diluted by the environment, it is not "more toxic" than the smoke inhaled by the smoker.

In addition, any attempt to measure ambient tobacco smoke must take into account complex variables such as smoke concentration, room volume, ventilation.

Another misconception is that the exposure of a nonsmoker can be measured in terms of a specific number of cigarettes. Although misleading, the concept of using a given number of cigarettes is understandable, especially for lay persons and non-medical journalists.

However, such an extrapolation involves highly unreliable estimates and is usually based upon unrealistic experiments.

Apart from a discussion of disease, there probably are physical irritations involved with exposure to high concentrations of tobacco smoke.

This may be caused by constituents of tobacco smoke like ammonia, acrolein and aldehydes, especially when they are coupled with warm, dry air.

It is not inconceivable that the odor and high visibility of tobacco smoke play a part in the annoyance reaction of some non-smokers to tobacco smoke.

Unfortunately, definite evidence available that such is the case does not exist. While there have been some experiments, which

create simulated exposures, these studies employ experimental conditions which are not typical of those in real life.

The medical literature to date does not indicate any significant health risk to the nonsmoker from environmental tobacco smoke normally encountered in day-to-day situations.

It is of interest to examine the observations of scientists who have generally expressed anti-tobacco sentiments.

For example, Dr. E. Cuyler Hamon, vice-president, Epidemiology and Statistical Research, of the American Cancer Society, addressed the International Conference on Public Education About Cancer in Monaco in 1974.

A delegate asked Dr. Hamon his views on the hazards of tobacco smoke on non-smokers who inhale it. The official summary proceedings of the conference reports:

"Dr. Hamon stated that there was no shred of evidence that a non-smoker can get cancer from second-hand smoke and there is a lot of evidence that he cannot... He added that to suggest passive smoking (inhlation of smoke by non-smokers) could cause cancer is dishonest, and that he would be prepared to testify as much in court."

Dr. Jonathan Rhoades, chairman of the National Cancer Advisory Board and a past-president of the American Cancer Society, is another prestigious spokesman for the anti-smoking movement. He declared:

"I do not have hard evidence in that direction (that there is a harmful effect from smoke on the non-smoker). To my knowledge, it is not, in fact, actually harmful."

The "Journal of Preventive Medicine" reported to its professional readership:

"It appears that passive inhalation of (second-hand) tobacco smoke by non-smokers or smokers does not increase their risk for chronic illnesses such as cancer of the respiratory tract, emphysema or cardiovascular disease."

Dr. Ernest Wynder, of the American Health Foundation, is one of the major scientific voices of the anti-smoking movement. He sums it up this way:

"Passive smoking can provide tears or can be otherwise disagreeable, but it has no influence on the health."

California legislators face a political decision concerning what some non-smokers find disagreeable or annoying.

To proclaim such a law necessary to protect the health of non-smokers is a premise contradicted by scientific evidence. The opinion of researchers does not provide a sound scientific basis upon which the proposed law may rest.

1005042851

The Tobacco Institute

This information is reprinted as a public service in the belief that controversial questions about smoking must be answered by scientific research and new knowledge and that full, free and informed public discussion is in the public interest.

1776 K St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006

The Other Side.

cccccc
cccccc
cccccc
cccccc
cccccc
cccccc

classico
classico
classico

卷之三

The
Borgess
Collection



BROADWAY THE HOTTEST NEW SHOP IN TOWN

10. *On the other hand, the author's* (1990) *claim that the* *introduction of* *the* *new* *methodology* *is* *not* *the* *main* *factor* *in* *the* *success* *of* *the* *new* *methodology* *is* *not* *correct*. *The* *introduction* *of* *the* *new* *methodology* *is* *the* *main* *factor* *in* *the* *success* *of* *the* *new* *methodology*.

BROADWAY FOR THE GREAT RIGHT WAY TO DRESS

recommendations. The following recommendations were made:
1. That the Board of Education be directed to make a study of the
present condition of the schools in the city and to submit a report
on the same at the next meeting of the Board.
2. That the Board of Education be directed to make a study of the
present condition of the schools in the city and to submit a report
on the same at the next meeting of the Board.
3. That the Board of Education be directed to make a study of the
present condition of the schools in the city and to submit a report
on the same at the next meeting of the Board.

1005047855

1005047857

